

S 19726

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 20, 1974

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish. It is part of it; there is plenty of money there.

Now, this amendment was considered by the subcommittee and was turned down. The Senator did appear and pressed his amendment, which is somewhat unusual, which is usually when these amendments come on the floor without anybody coming down talking about them, but—

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish. The Senator will have all the time he wants.

Mr. CHILES. Yes, but I want to correct the Senator.

The amendment was not considered by the subcommittee and turned down. The subcommittee told me to come to the floor with the amendment. The subcommittee did not consider the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All right, we did not have a record vote, a rollcall vote on it, but the Senator got the word, did he not, down there in the subcommittee?

Go to the full committee, and the Senator did not go there.

Mr. CHILES. No, sir, because the subcommittee's action took the place of the full committee, so I did not have the opportunity to go there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All right, let me finish.

Here is an amendment that is not necessary at all for the purposes. My State should be doing this and is doing it now.

They do not need money from the Federal Government. They get plenty under the broad purposes of the billion dollar social services program. Here is an amendment that has no budget request, no hearings, no requests to testify, no regulations to administer, and it duplicates and overlaps the OEO programs.

It is a worthy purpose.

I do not know what my State would do with this. Would it set up a new division when they should be doing it now? If they are not doing it, what are they doing with their share of the hundreds of millions of dollars from social services which fits into this thing.

I know this being proposed under the Older Americans Act, I want to say a person can get just as cold when he is 59 as he can when he is 61. The Senator knows that, does he not?

This is for people who cannot afford it. I do not know what we are going to do. We cannot subsidize everything.

The Senator's proposal is for making plans. My suggestion is the plans should be done by the States now. If they are not doing that, they are not carrying out their purposes.

The proposal is intended to develop agreements with the State petroleum allocation offices for meeting needs of elderly persons. Well, they ought to be doing that now in the State office. They do not need Federal funds to march down to the capital and do that.

It encourages State public utility commissions. My State already held about 3 months of hearings on this under the State appropriations, not using any Federal funds.

Education to winterize older persons' homes? I guess that is good, but the State ought to be doing that. What is the purpose of getting the Federal Government into this?

If we start this, what is going to happen, without any program, without any hearings, and everything else? The next thing is there will be a subsidy to take care of the extra fuel costs. I might be for that, but I can get all the information I need from my State as to whether that is necessary or not. They do not need to have a piece of \$10 million on top of hundreds of millions of dollars that are directed toward these goals.

The Older Americans Act supplemented all of these programs. It happened to be directed more specifically to the problems of the older Americans.

As I said to the Senator from Louisiana, there are 36 items in this bill. I think that many of the social service ones could contribute to exactly what the Senator from Florida wants to do under the broad objectives of the program.

So I am going to have to oppose this for the reasons I have stated: There was no budget request, no hearings, no requests to testify, no regulations to administer, it duplicates and overlaps OEO and a score of other programs, and the States should be doing this themselves. They have money to do it.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I will not belabor the point. The distinguished chairman makes a very good philosophical argument as to the fact that perhaps the States should be doing things like this themselves. I might tend to buy that. I did not pass the Older Americans Act, it passed before I got here.

Perhaps, everything that the Older Americans Act is doing the States could do for themselves. Everything that we are talking about in this bill we could say the States should be doing for themselves. Why have a Department of HEW? Let the States handle that for themselves.

That same kind of argument just could cut all the way down.

But we have an Older Americans Act. Under the Older Americans Act, the States are required if they want to get any funds under title II, to come up with this plan. But you have not given them any wherewithal to carry out the program.

The only thing I am saying is if you are going to give them a requirement, then you ought to give them the wherewithal to do it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They do not need any wherewithal to come up with a plan.

Mr. CHILES. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sometimes there seems to be more planners in social services than there are recipients of the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield back the remainder of his time? Is all time yielded back?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield back the remainder of my time, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is

on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Third reading.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I say to my distinguished chairman I understand that two or three Senators are on their way, I hope, to offer amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HASKELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

Sec. 204. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act which are available during the fiscal year 1975 for travel expenses, including subsistence allowances, of Government officers and employees may be obligated, after the date of the enactment of this Act, at a rate which exceeds 75 percent of the rate at which amounts for such expenses were obligated during the fiscal year 1974.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, on behalf of 13 of my distinguished colleagues and myself, I am submitting an amendment to reduce the amount of Federal funds spent on travel and transportation.

The cosponsors are Senators McCLELLAN, BAYH, BEALL, BIDEN, BROCK, HARRY F. BYRD, JR., CASE, DOMINICK, METZENBAUM, WILLIAM L. SCOTT, STEVENSON, TAFT, and TUNNEY.

Specifically, this amendment would prohibit the Federal Government from expending more than 75 percent of the amount expended in fiscal year 1974 for the travel and transportation of persons. A recent examination of the Budget by my staff and the GAO revealed that the Federal Government will spend almost \$2 billion this fiscal year on travel and transportation to out-of-town conferences, meetings, and other employee transportation.

With inflation being fed by excessive Federal spending and with the vital need to conserve energy, there is absolutely no justification for the Federal Government to spend such sums on travel expenses.

This 25 percent reduction in Federal travel expenses would save nearly \$400 million in this year's budget and untold millions of dollars in energy costs. Such a move would not only set an example for the concerned people of this Nation, it would provide additional fuel that could

November 20, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 19725

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHILES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To whom would this \$10 million be appropriated?

Mr. CHILES. The \$10 million would be appropriated under title III, State and community programs for aging, of the Older Americans Act, as amended.

The funds would be provided to the State and area agencies on aging to carry out the action program on energy as required by the Administration on Aging.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Who would administer the funds? How would they be allocated to the different States? How would they be administered?

Mr. CHILES. The Administration on Aging would administer the funds, and the funds would go through the State agencies on aging.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the formula for allocating it to each State?

Mr. CHILES. It would be on the basis of population of persons 60 and over.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are there some States where the need would not be as great, States in the warmer climate, as opposed to States of more severe climate? I am trying to understand it.

I think everybody wants to do something to relieve distress. But does each individual old couple living here who are not able to pay their gas bill or to get coal or something, are they people who have to file a claim or how is it administered? I am trying to find out.

Mr. CHILES. No, sir; there would not be funds to actually meet energy costs.

What the Administration on Aging has required is that every State now start coming up with a plan that would indicate how they will handle those kinds of requests; whether they will try to get the United Funds to come in and help, whether they will try to get the Salvation Army, how they will proceed with the electric companies in respect to the termination of power for these elderly people; the \$10 million proposed by this amendment would help in implementing those plans among the 50 States.

This is not funding to buy any fuel oil. There just is not that amount of money, and there is no way that is going to work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I realize it is not, but I am trying to understand how will they be helped by it, how will they be helped, those who are going to need it.

Mr. CHILES. Specifically, it would fund State agencies on aging to: First, develop agreements with State allocation offices in the event of shortages to provide for meeting the needs of older people; second, to make representations before public utility commissions, to encourage equitable utility rates for the elderly, and to develop procedures to prevent the arbitrary termination of services for older people; third, to develop a program of assistance and education for the winterizing of older people's homes; fourth, to develop a program to coordinate efforts to meet the special energy requirements of the elderly during emergency situations.

Those are the things I would hope this amount of money would help formulate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What it appears we are doing is appropriate money without any program, without any authority, without any constituted source of responsibility for the administration of it.

Mr. CHILES. No, Mr. President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can understand this general idea may have some merit, but—

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, that is not correct because we do have authorization under title III. The State agencies on aging are in fact being required under the law to implement such a program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What agency of the State?

What I read here, title 3 to which the Senator referred, it says:

"Sec. 301. It is the purpose of this title to encourage and assist State and local agencies to concentrate resources in order to develop greater capacity and foster the development of comprehensive and coordinated service systems to serve older persons by entering into new cooperative arrangements with each other and with providers of social services for planning for the provisions of, and providing, social services and, where necessary, to reorganize or reassign functions, in order to—

"(1) secure and maintain maximum independence and dignity in a home environment for older persons capable of self-care with appropriate supportive services; and

"(2) remove individual and social barriers to economic and personal independence for older persons.

I do not see anything in there that authorizes the distribution of fuel or where they would acquire the fuel for them, or anything.

It is something in general terms, some generalities there that may go further than I have read.

Mr. CHILES. Well, if I could, I would like to read to the chairman and put in the Record a program instruction from the Office of Human Development, Administration on Aging, dated October 4, 1974. This is directed to the State agencies administering plans under title 3 and title 7 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, and the subject of it is additional instructions concerning State plans on aging for fiscal year 1975.

Under this, each of the State agencies are directed to provide an action program on older persons and the energy crisis.

It states:

The continuing problems experienced because of the shortage of energy resources have an extremely severe impact on older persons. This problem is aggravated by the current inflationary situation. State Agencies on Aging have a responsibility under their legislative mandate to take positive actions in response to this critical situation so that the burden on older persons may be alleviated. The coming winter months promise to create devastating hardships on the older population unless we intervene now. In order for approval to be granted to the 1975 State Plans on Aging, the State Agencies must provide assurance in their State Plans that they will—

1. Develop an agreement with the State Allocation Office, in the event of shortages, that will provide for reorganizing and dealing with the special needs of older persons;

2. Make representations before the Public Utility Commission designed to lead to the development of regulations that would insure equitable utility rates for older persons;

3. Work for the development of an agreement with the Public Service Commission to insure that services will not be arbitrarily cut off to older persons unable to pay for such services;

4. Develop a program, utilizing existing public and private resources to assist in the insulation of older persons' homes; and

5. Develop a program, utilizing existing public and private resources designed to provide older persons and volunteers who serve older persons with additional resources for transportation in order to offset rising transportation costs.

So it has been directed that each State will amend their State plan and carry out such a program.

What I am saying is that we have ordered them to do this without providing any kind of funds for that purpose. Either they are either going to take from existing programs or they are not going to fully implement the energy program.

I think it is so necessary that we provide some kind of help for elderly people with the energy problem, and that is what I am trying to do with this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHILES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this program sounds good, but the Senator from Florida just pointed out what is wrong with it at the end of his remarks.

This is a matter which the States ought to be doing anyway. In most States this would come under the social rehabilitation and the welfare program, and we have hundreds of millions of dollars in the bill for that. We do not need \$10 million more for those States to effect plans. All States ought to be doing that anyway, and most of them, I imagine, do have plans.

Now, I do not know why the Federal Government should get into the act when we are giving them hundreds, hundreds of millions through the social rehabilitation and the welfare programs and the social programs in the State. I am sure Florida gets its share. That is part of the programs they should be doing anyhow and they have plenty of money to do it.

As a matter of fact, in some cases, the social services in some States are oversupplied with money. That is what is wrong with some of them; they have so much administration that people do not get the things they should get and there is a welfare surplus that they are not spending. They did not estimate that correctly, and there is a surplus of about \$1.2 billion that has not been spent.

So here is another program. The amendment of the Senator from Florida starts a new program on top of it. The States do not need any direct help for \$10 million to do this. They can do it anyway. They have got money to do it.

Mr. CHILES. I wonder if the chairman understands that the Older Americans Act is not a welfare program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, but to do this is part of the social services that can be done in the States.

Mr. CHILES. No, it is not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know what the—

Mr. CHILES. It is part of human development.

be used in the private sector of the economy and save thousands of jobs.

Inflation and the need to save energy have caused millions of Americans to cut back or cancel their travel plans. Virtually every business and private organization has been forced to reduce its travel budget to save fuel and money. Yet the Federal Government has made no effort to cut back on its travel budget.

Every Federal department and agency has some fat in its travel budget that can be cut to save fuel and money, including the Defense Department. I wish to emphasize that this travel limitation is not intended to apply to troop movements. Since last December, the Defense Department has been the Government's number one energy saver by cutting its fuel consumption by 31 percent. I believe the Department can follow suit and trim some fat out of its travel budget without jeopardizing our national security.

Wisely, the President has called on all Americans to conserve fuel and budget their money wisely. But if the Federal Government expects the American people to cut energy consumption and sacrifice in the battle against inflation, the Federal Government must provide the leadership.

A 25 percent cut in travel expenditures would save nearly a half billion dollars, conserve fuel, and demonstrate to the American people that the Federal Government is serious in its efforts to lead this country through a very difficult period and win the battle against inflation.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am empowered, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, to accept the amendment, which I think is an excellent one.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the majority leader and the chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTH. I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 19, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

Funds appropriated under "Occupational, Vocational, and Adult Education" in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act, 1975 for carrying out career education under the Cooperative Research Act shall be available only to carry out the provisions of section 406 of Public Law 93-380.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, one of the most promising movements in American education is the development of what is called career education. This is the effort to bring the worlds of education and work into closer contact so as to make education more relevant to successful participation in the society at large.

For several years now, the administration has requested funds for the development of this concept on the Federal level, but has been turned down, at least in part, because of a lack of direct legislative authority for such a program.

Finally, in this year's Labor-HEW appropriation bill, both the House and Senate appropriated \$10 million for this purpose under the general authority of the Cooperative Research Act. At the same time this was taking place, we were putting the finishing touches on what is now 93-380, the Education Act of 1974. Contained in that act is a provision, section 406, directly addressed to the career education question.

This amendment which I am offering would simply require the Department to conduct its career education activities under the new authority specifically provided for this purpose in Public Law 93-380, rather than the more general authority of the Cooperative Research Act.

This does not add a penny to the bill and will have the effect of seeing to it that these funds will be expended according to the most specific and most recent expression of congressional intent.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to clear up one question with regard to the intention of section 406 which has recently arisen. Although the emphasis in this section is on career education programs in grades K-12, the bill and particularly the Senate committee report make clear that grants under this section are available to institutions of postsecondary education as well as elementary and secondary schools. We particularly did not want to discourage comprehensive State programs which might include a postsecondary career education component.

I urge the adoption of the amendment. I understand that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), who is not present, is willing to accept the amendment. As I mentioned, it does not involve any additional expenditure whatsoever.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER TO HOLD H.R. 16757. AT DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 16757, to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 until August 31, 1975, when it is received in the Senate, be held at the desk temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16900) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am informed that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), has indicated that he is agreeable to this amendment by the distinguished Senator from Maine, and I therefore urge its adoption.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, I send an unprinted amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 10 after the period, insert the following:

*Provided*, That the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall receive grants for the current fiscal year pursuant to sections 121, 122, and 123 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as such Act exists on the date of enactment of this Act) in amounts equal to not less than the amounts received by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, pursuant to sections 103(a)(5), 103(a)(6), and 103(a)(7), respectively, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as such Act existed immediately before the effective date of the amendments made to title I of such Act by the Education Amendments of 1974).

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, this amendment likewise would not add any money to the supplemental appropriations bill. Rather, its purpose is to make a technical change which would "hold harmless" to last year's level the amount which Puerto Rico receives for State agency programs under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The amendment would merely provide last year's level of funding in Puerto Rico for title I State agency programs for handicapped children, neglected and

November 20, 1974

delinquent children, and children in adult correctional institutions.

I have discussed this amendment with the chairman of the HEW subcommittee, and I understand that he is in agreement with it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am informed that this amendment is likewise satisfactory to the chairman of the committee, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, I call up my printed amendment No. 1980 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 21, strike the figure "\$120,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$146,393,000".

On page 11, line 3, strike the figure "\$4,351,043,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,377,436,000".

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, this amendment would continue funding at the present level for title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This title provides for grants of limited duration to State and local educational agencies for the purpose of stimulating innovation in education methods. The committee recommendation for funding is \$120 million—which is \$26 million below this year's level and the President's budget request. My amendment would restore the cuts made by the committee and leave the program at the present amount—\$146,393,000.

In my opinion, the major thrust of the entire Federal education effort—which only amounts to about 7 percent of total school expenditures—has been and should continue to be in the areas of innovation and development. Title I has focused on the special educational problems of the disadvantaged and has stimulated an enormous amount of new activity in this field. Title II has assisted in the development of new resource programs through aid to libraries and associated services. And title III has, for the first time, made significant amounts of funds available expressly for the purpose of innovation and development.

The first point to be made about title III is that it has worked. Almost three-quarters of the projects funded have been continued with State or local funds after the 3-year Federal support period terminated. In light of the constraints on local school budgets over the past several years, this is an amazing record. Further, there is evidence that a significant number of these projects—about one third according to most estimates—are being adopted by other schools or school systems. And of course, beyond strict replication of specific projects, many of the concepts and techniques developed under title III have been used in modified form throughout the country.

Because of the concern with being able to assess and repeat successful programs, these projects are subject to an elaborate and comprehensive evaluation procedure at each step of their existence. First, each project must have a detailed plan in order to qualify for funding. Before being funded, these plans are subject to review by a State level title III Advisory Council, the State education agency, and often, a panel of outside experts. Second, each program is evaluated annually by the State agency as well as being in continuing liaison with the State. Finally, especially successful projects are nominated by their State for "validation," the process by which the Federal Office of Education certifies projects for replication elsewhere. Here the project is analyzed in terms of cost-effectiveness, exportability and its effect on student achievement.

I am sure that cases can be cited where these projects have been controversial, poorly executed or just plain failures. But any program of innovation and development will involve blind alleys and unsuccessful projects. It would be a poor program of innovation of there were no failures. I think the high continuation rate by the States and localities is very strong evidence of the usefulness of this program.

Finally, it should be apparent that all is not well with American education. Our people sense it in their refusal to support its funding at previous levels. And our inability to deal adequately with national problems such as inflation and the energy shortage indicate, at least in part, a failure of the educational system.

At this time of change and crisis, cuts in funds for innovation and development seem particularly untimely. We spend less than 1 percent of our education funds for development; and title III constitutes 80 percent of this tiny amount, title III is cost effective and the evidence is that it works. I hope Senators will join with me in helping to preserve the vital role of this program in American education.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I think it would be well for the Members of the Senate before voting on this amendment to take account of what is being done in this field already.

According to the Senate report under the title of "Supplementary Services" the report states:

The bill contains \$120,000,000 for supplementary services authorized by Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The amount recommended is a decrease of \$26,393,000 below the request—I think that means budget request—"and \$5 million below the House allowance."

Now, this is what I think is significant and it ought to be taken into account:

Under this program, grants are awarded to State and local educational agencies primarily to support projects considered to be exemplary and/or innovative. Although supportive of the thrust of this program, the Committee is not convinced that all of the more than 1,800 projects currently in operation should continue. The Committee con-

curs with the House concerning the ability to monitor this activity so as to allow successful projects to be replicated. For these reasons, the Committee has also reduced the request for advance funding for Title III programs included under support and innovation grants.

Well, Mr. President, it does seem to me that if we are now supporting 1,800 of these individual projects that out of those we should learn something, and if we cannot learn something from that number, why, we had better begin reducing this program.

I do not think more money is needed. I think the House was wise in cutting it some. It is now \$20-some-odd million below the budget.

To add back to it is just giving money to a program that may or may not be working. We have a chance to determine out of 1,800 if any of these programs are any good and, if they are, to make use of them.

Somewhere, Mr. President, in the expenditure of over \$300 billion a year there are areas where cuts can and should be made without doing any irreparable harm, and be done at a saving, and be done prudently.

Certainly a prudent reduction could be made in this item and, for that reason, I shall support the action of the committee.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire want some time?

Mr. COTTON. Just one word.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I would simply like to report, in the absence of the Senator from Washington, that we agree with every word that our distinguished chairman of the committee has said.

Now, at the time our subcommittee met and we took the evidence on this matter we found there were in existence already various experimental projects, innovative projects or special projects, and according to the testimony of the Office of Education, over 1,700 of those projects were going throughout the country. At least one representative—I do not think it was the commissioner of the Office of Education, but one of the witnesses—admitted that it was utterly impossible, of course, to monitor any such number of projects and be familiar with their purpose and their success, and most of them have run for 2 or 3 years. Now those projects cannot all be good. They may be good in purpose but they cannot all be effective projects.

It seems that this is one point where, without ending the program, we could be a little more sparing in the money that we appropriated and, therefore, both the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, and I am entirely in agreement with the chairman of the full committee, and we feel we must oppose this amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I anticipate that the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Washington, will be on the floor in a minute. But, if I may ask the Senator, the ranking member on the subcommittee, according to the information I have from the testi-